	Case 2:05-cv-01959-TSZ Document 7 F	iled 12/13/05 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
7		
8		
9	INVESTOR COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC.,	
10	Petitioner,	No. C05-1959Z
11	V.	ORDER
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and	
13	PAUL SHIPLEY, REVENUE AGENT, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,	
14	Respondents.	
15		
16	This matter comes before the Court on the United States' (Respondent) Motion to	
17	Dismiss, docket no. 4. In accordance with 26 U.S.C. § 7609(b)(2)(A), Investor	
18	Communications International, Inc. (Petitioner) properly filed its Amended Petition to Quash	
19	Summons, docket no. 3, with the Court. However, Petitioner failed to follow the	
20	requirements of 26 U.S.C. § 7609(b)(2)(B) because it did not properly serve the United	
21	States.	
22	Because 26 U.S.C. § 7609 contains a waiver of the United States' immunity against	
23	suit, such waivers must be strictly and narrowly construed. See United States v. Sherwood,	
24	313 U.S. 584, 590 (1941). As such, failure to serve the United States deprives the Court of	
25	jurisdiction as the United States has only waived its sovereign immunity for the 20 day	
26	period subsequent to the date of issuing the Secretary's notice. See 26 U.S.C. §	
	ORDER -1-	

1	7609(b)(2)(B); Maikranz v. United States, 612 F. Supp. 590, 591 (S.D. Ind. 1985); Dorsey	
2	United States, 618 F. Supp. 471 (D.Md. 1985); see also Yocum v. United States, 586 F.	
3	Supp. 317, 318 (N.D. Ind. 1984) ("Strict construction of statutes that waive sovereign	
4	immunity extends to the statutory time limitations contained therein."). Petitioner admitted	
5	failed to properly serve the United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington	
6	and the Attorney General of the United States in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 as	
7	directed by the Secretary's notice that accompanied the copy of summons.	
8	Accordingly, the Court finds that the Petitioner's failure to follow the Secretary's	
9	directions deprives the Court of subject matter jurisdiction to hear its claim. Therefore,	
10	Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, docket no. 4, is GRANTED, and Petitioner's Amended	
11	Petition to Quash Summons, docket no. 3, is DISMISSED.	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
13	DATED this 13th day of December, 2005.	
14		
15	Thomas S. Zilly	
16	United States District Judge	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

26